



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,290	01/14/2005	Suzanne Van Egmond	NL 020637	8577
24737	7590	01/25/2006		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER LIE, ANGELA M	
			ART UNIT 2821	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,290

Applicant(s)

VAN EGMOND, SUZANNE

Examiner

Angela M. Lie

Art Unit

2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


TAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/8/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-5 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 is a method claim for identifying the type of discharge lamp, while claims 2-5 are device/apparatus claims and they depend on independent claim 1. Such a dependency is incorrect, because method and apparatus claims shall not be mixed together. The applicant is suggested to rewrite claim 2 (apparatus claim) in the independent form, so it no longer depends on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Giannopoulos et al (US Patent 6160361).

As to claim 1, Giannopoulos discloses an apparatus capable of performing a method comprising the steps of: applying an amplitude modulated control current (Figure 2, element 107; column 1, lines 54-55; wherein the current level corresponds to current amplitude) to a discharge lamp (Figure 1, element 25), detecting the peak value of the lamp voltage at a rising edge of the envelope of the modulated control current

Art Unit: 2821

(column 1, lines 50-59), and comparing the detected peak value with previously recorded peak values for different lamp types (column 1, lines 62-64; wherein the data has to be stored in order to be compared later on, because otherwise such a comparison would not be possible), and assigning the detected peak value to a lamp on the basis of the comparison (column 1, lines 62-64).

As to claim 2, Giannopoulos discloses a device comprising: means for supplying a control current (Figure 2, elements 101 and 107) to a discharge lamp (Figure 1, element 25), is characterized by the presence of means for amplitude-modulating the control current to the lamp (column 1, lines 54-55, wherein current level corresponds to current amplitude), peak detection means for detecting the peak voltage across the lamp at a rising edge of the envelope of the envelope of the amplitude-modulated control current (column 1, lines 51-59), recording means for recording peak voltages associated with lamp types (Figure 1, elements 49 and 42) and means for comparing the measured peak voltage with the recorded peak voltages and supplying a lamp type-indicating signal on the basis of the comparison (column 1, lines 62-67, and column 2, lines 1-7).

As to claim 3, Giannopoulos discloses a device wherein the means for supplying a control current to the lamp are formed by a source of comparatively high-frequency square wave voltage supplying (column 2, line 57), via a series-resonance chain (column 2, lines 58-59), a corresponding control current to the lamp (Figure 1, element 25), characterized in that means are present for square-wave frequency modulating the comparatively high-frequency square-wave voltage (column 2, lines 57-58).

As to claim 4, Giannopoulos discloses a device wherein the means for supplying a control current to the lamp are formed by a source of comparatively high-frequency square wave voltage supplying (column 2, line 57), via a series-resonance chain (column 2, lines 58-59), a corresponding control current to the lamp (Figure 1, element 25), characterized in that means are present for square-wave pulse width modulating the comparatively high-frequency square-wave voltage (column 2, lines 57-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giannopoulos et al (US Patent 6160361) in the view of Alexandrov (US Publication 2004/0124785). Giannopoulos teaches a device as claimed in claim 2, wherein the means for supplying a control current to the lamp are formed by a source of a comparatively high-frequency square-wave voltage supplying (column 2, lines 57-61), via a series-resonance chain (column 2, line 59), a corresponding control current to the lamp (column 1, line 54). Furthermore he also teaches means for square-wave amplitude modulating the direct voltage supplied to the source of a comparatively high-frequency square-wave voltage (column 2, lines 57-58, and column 1, lines 54-55). Giannopoulos, however does not teach that the source of comparatively high-frequency

Art Unit: 2821

square wave voltage is fed with a direct voltage from an AC/DC converter. Alexandrov teaches an apparatus for arc detection in discharge lamp wherein the circuitry comprises AC/DC converter (Figure 2, element AC/DC converter). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art during the time the invention was made to incorporate AC/DC converter as taught by Alexandrov into the apparatus taught by Giannopoulos, because as shown in Giannopoulos's circuit the input starts from the DC source (Figure 1, element 13), and it is well know in the art that the standard house outlet supplies AC signal (<http://www.school-for-champions.com/science/acwiring.htm>), so that in order to make it possible for the user to use the apparatus at home if needed, it would be beneficiary to include AC/DC converter. It would be a very convenient solution since a user would not need to use an additional converter. Furthermore it would provide AC/DC converter along with the apparatus would prevent from possible damage to the equipment caused by the user connecting wrong AC/DC converter with the apparatus.

The Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- WO 00/07415 discloses ballast for operating different types of lamp loads through the identification of the lamp.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela M. Lie whose telephone number is 571-272-8445. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Angela M Lie



**TAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Application/Control Number: 10/521,290
Art Unit: 2821

Page 7